

APPENDIX C  
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

**MAINE ATLANTIC SALMON COMMISSION**

**DENNYS RIVER CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT PLAN/INITIAL PUBLIC INPUT  
MEETING**

**MEDDYBEMPS COMMUNITY CENTER**

**MEETING MINUTES-SESSION 1**

**ATTENDEES:** Alan Habershtock, Kleinschmidt Associates  
Barbara S. Arter, BSA Consulting  
Joe Wiley, IFW/DOC  
Joan Trial, ASC  
Linda Gordon, Selectman  
Charles White, Trailmaster  
Ed Bartlett, Dennys River Sportsman's Club  
Tracy L. Smith, Interested party  
Bill Cherry, Bill Cherry Forestry Service  
Maurry Mills, Dennys River Water Council  
Fred Kircheis, ASC  
James C. Sullivan, Dennysville Selectman  
John Wakin, Meddybemps Selectman  
Steve Koenig, SHARE  
Mary Anne Clancy, Bangor Daily News  
Marty Anderson, NOAA Fisheries  
Ray Robinson, Dennysville  
Jim Robinson, Dennysville  
Jon Christensen, Kleinschmidt Associates  
Allison Murray, Kleinschmidt Associates  
Torrey Sheafe, Kleinschmidt Associates  
Everett Gillespie, Meddybemps

**DATE:** November 14, 2002; 3:00 p.m. session

---

Current Land Uses Identified in the Project Area

- 1.0 Fishing
  - 1.1 Old Gilman Dam
  - 1.2 First Rips on River (Little Falls) is okay fishing
  - 1.3 Question: Why are salmon marked with different colors?
  - 1.4 Answer: They are marked according to where they are stocked in the river.
- 2.0 Access
  - 2.1 Current private access point at Gilman Dam (below school bus) which is located 7 miles downstream of Meddybemps
  - 2.2 Overnight campers total around 100/year

- 2.3 Rob Scribner (Downeast Canoe & Kayak) can confirm these numbers
- 2.4 Access is depending on flows from Meddybemps Dam (controversial)
- 2.5 Question of installing a historical interpretive sign at Gilman Dam
- 2.6 Answer: General consensus is to leave it the same without any signage
- 3.0 Camping
  - 3.1 Question: Is there a need for fire rings installed at potential camp sites at Stoddard & Little Falls?
  - 3.2 Answer: Operations & Maintenance/Safety issues. General consensus is to leave the campsites as they are.
- 4.0 Hiking/Biking/Cross County Skiing
  - 4.1 Access does exist to meet river uses but limited vistas, so the river is not currently a destination
  - 4.2 Potential Rails to Trails destination
  - 4.3 Current access trail is adequate.
  - 4.4 General consensus is that the current access is adequate and no new trails should be constructed.
- 5.0 Forestry
  - 5.1 Logging roads should be closed in the spring to minimize road maintenance
  - 5.2 Question: Should any more trees be removed?
  - 5.3 Answer: General consensus is not to remove any more trees from forest production in an economically depressed area
  - 5.4 Any revenue generated from forestry will be put back into stewardship/protection of the Project Area.
  - 5.5 Fir tipping should be allowed
  - 5.6 Forest should be managed for fire protection
- 6.0 Research
  - 6.1 There is a need to access the river for research purposes
- 7.0 Recreational Vehicles (ATVs & Snowmobiles)
  - 7.1 Trails should be closed in the spring to minimize damage to roads during mud season
  - 7.2 Access to these trails should continue although limit vehicular access
  - 7.3 Access/use at Cathance Lake outlet & Curry Brook area
  - 7.4 Snowmobile club grooms trails at their expense
  - 7.5 Trails could bring money into the area
  - 7.6 Look for chances to hook four-season access into certain areas
  - 7.7 Question: How about a new ATV trail from the top of the Project Area to the bottom?
- 8.0 Hunting
  - 8.1 Deer herds are disappearing
  - 8.2 Good bird hunting
  - 8.3 Bear baiting is not active on private land because of insurance issues
  - 8.4 Attracts stray ATVs
- 9.0 Trapping
  - 9.1 Limited activity with: fox, coyote, muskrat, beaver, bobcats
- 10.0 Existing River Crossings
  - 10.1 Curry Brook
  - 10.2 Gardiner Rips
  - 10.3 Venture Brook
  - 10.4 No identified fords on the mainstem

- 11.0 Ecotourism
  - 11.1 Question: Should the Project Area be marketed or just leave it alone?
  - 11.2 Ecotourism needs to be balanced with protection
  - 11.3 Very limited income/money from these activities
  - 11.4 Answer: Consensus is to not market the Project Area.
- 12.0 Fire Control/Management
  - 12.1 Fires should be by permit only
  - 12.2 Forest fire control ability is limited by access
- 13.0 Stewardship/Operation
  - 13.1 It is hoped that local conservation groups will adopt sections of the Project Area
  - 13.2 Education and outreach is an important goal for the young
  - 13.3 Coordination is important with 319 NPS Watershed Survey and 319 Watershed Management Plan by Project SHARE and state/local comprehensive plans
  - 13.4 Economics: How would outreach be funded?

**Maine Atlantic Salmon Commission**  
**Dennys River Corridor Management Plan/Initial Public Input Meeting**  
**Meddybemps Community Center**

**MEETING MINUTES-SESSION 2**

*Additional Attendance: Joan Trial, Allison Murray, Jon Christensen, Alan Habershtock, Torrey Sheafe*

**ATTENDEES:** Bob Hinton, Downeast River Coalition & Dennys River Sportsman's Club  
Jon Reisman, First Selectman, Cooper  
Charles Corliss, LURC  
James Hall, IF&W  
Thom Budzik, Resident of Meddybemps  
JoAnna Budzik, Resident of Meddybemps  
Deane L. Bradshaw, Dennys River Watershed Council  
**DATE:** November 14, 2002; 7:00 p.m. session

---

Current Land Uses Identified in the Project Area

- 1.0 Proposed budget for Management Activities.
  - 1.1 Periods for road maintenance/bridges
  - 1.2 Timber revenues back into stewardship
  - 1.3 No tax burden for towns
  - 1.4 Per ASC, some stewardship funds available
  - 1.5 Agreement with Dennysville: \$30K, dry hydrant, gravel and firehouse
- 2.0 Roads/Access
  - 2.1 Maintain very, very limited access
  - 2.2 Right-of-way access to corridor currently obtained over Haynes land
  - 2.3 Cathance Stream (keep access w/stewardship)
  - 2.4 Two specific private access points (head of river & Gilman Dam are the two existing points) should be maintained with no new access points developed in Project Area
  - 2.5 Access needs to be publicly owned – Can't assume that private access will be available
  - 2.6 Canoe access limited by time of year and temperature/flows
  - 2.7 Existing put-in and take-out is private. Replace those?
  - 2.8 Designated sites exist already
  - 2.9 Tourist attraction will increased use = big problems?
  - 2.10 Increased access = increased salmon impacts
  - 2.11 Barbara: Cater to those who don't know where access is by identifying it
  - 2.12 Bob: The mystique of finding/exploring the area on ones own is important
  - 2.13 Public access is more than vehicular access
  - 2.14 Limited and controlled access to inhibit NPS pollution
  - 2.15 Needed access through IP
  - 2.16 Until current private access is denied, developing additional access is not recommended
- 3.0 Salmon Conservation
  - 3.1 Should be number one priority
  - 3.2 Low impact use only

- 4.0 Stewardship
  - 4.1 Local Community (Watershed Council) are the eyes and ears
- 5.0 Any plan for future land acquisition?
  - 5.1 Make the answer part of the plan
- 6.0 Revisit/Update LMP – “Living Plan”
  - 6.1 Plan should indicate triggers/events/reasons to revisit and modify plan over the years
- 7.0 Canoeing
  - 7.1 Estimated Fifty trips/people/season
- 8.0 Camping
  - (much the same discussion as in first session)
- 9.0 Hunting/Trapping/Bear Bait
  - 9.1 Waterfowl, partridge, deer, bear, coyote
  - 9.2 Don’t make easier access; Leave as is
- 10.0 Fire Management
  - 10.1 Is air access enough?
  - 10.2 Strategies relative to roads
    - 10.2.1 Existing roads
    - 10.2.2 Suitable for fire management?
  - 10.3 Water source? River? What implications does this have for habitat impacts if used during fire fighting?
  - 10.4 Blueberry barrens – no irrigation demands on river
  - 10.5 Consider abutters – Don’t just let it burn
- 11.0 Water Quality
  - 11.1 Unknown
  - 11.2 Strategy for hazardous/unforeseen input/spill should be included in LMP
- 12.0 Tipping
  - 12.1 Done right – no problem – should be allowed
- 13.0 Forest Management
  - 13.1 Improve riparian function through proactive management
  - 13.2 MFS Skidder bridge program Are they used on smaller streams?
- 14.0 Recreation (ATV’s, Snowmobiles, etc)
  - 14.1 ATV’s are a potential problem
    - 14.1.1 Need to limit
  - 14.2 Snowmobiles are low impact
    - 14.2.1 Ice & Snow = minimal habitat impacts
  - 14.3 RR Tracks taken out to use for trails?
  - 14.4 Skiing from Gilman Dam accessed via 191
  - 14.5 No new trails were recommended
- 15.0 Deer wintering areas – have these been identified and will seasonal use impact them?
- 16.0 Purpose of Management Plan if salmon are gone?
  - 16.1 Maintain Habitat
- 17.0 Fishing
  - 17.1 Very little populations of trout
  - 17.2 No salmon
- 18.0 Hatchery
  - 18.1 Plans for a river-specific hatchery on Dennys River in LMP?
  - 18.2 Plan may identify potential sites

**Maine Atlantic Salmon Commission**  
**Dennys River Corridor Management Plan/Final Public Input Meeting**  
**E.D.M. Youth Center**  
**June 6, 2003 7 PM**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**ATTENDEES:** Barbara Arter, BSA Consulting  
Dean L. Bradshaw, Dennys River Watershed Council  
Bill Cherry, Bill Cherry Forestry Services  
Jon Christensen, Kleinschmidt  
Norm Dube, Atlantic Salmon Commission  
Alan Haberstock, Kleinschmidt  
Bob Hinton, Downeast River Coalition & Dennys River Sportsman's Club  
Sheila & Barry Huckins, Dennys River Watershed Council  
Greg Mackey, Atlantic Salmon Commission  
Maurry Mills, Moosehorn National Wildlife Refuge  
Allison Murray, Kleinschmidt  
Joel Pickelner, Quoddy Regional Land Trust  
Jon Reisman, Town of Cooper  
Matt Scott, Sportsman's Alliance of Maine  
Torrey Sheafe, Kleinschmidt  
James Sullivan, Town of Dennysville

**DATE:** June 6, 2003; 7:00 p.m.

The purpose of this meeting was to gather final comments/input on the Dennys River Corridor Land Management Plan Draft version released May 1, 2003.

1. Summary of Major Comments
  - a. 4 out of 32 Advisory Group members submitted comments.
  - b. Recommended changes and/or clarifications were suggested on 7 out of the 12 chapters.
  - c. Most common comments included the following issues:
    - i. Fire Control
      1. Stakeholders suggested that there should be a periodic review and a standard survey conducted of potential fuel buildup within the corridor to minimize the risk of forest fires.
      2. Several towns admit that their volunteer fire departments have limited and aging man/woman power and may not be equipped for fighting forest fires.
    - ii. Water Withdrawal
      1. Water withdrawal for the purposes of fighting fires should be permitted at the discretion of the on-scene responders. It was agreed, however, that this is not an issue appropriately dealt with in a *land* management plan.
      2. It was agreed that the Steward will be responsible for establishing priorities for water withdrawal for the purposes of fire suppression.
    - iii. Beaver

1. It was suggested that the focus on beavers in the LMP should be expanded to include general wildlife.
2. Additional Comments
  - a. Stakeholders suggested that the Steward should be responsible for ensuring that the Cathance Lake outlet fishway be kept free from debris to allow unobstructed fish passage.
  - b. Stakeholders fear that There should be a periodic review and a standard survey conducted of potential fuel buildup within the corridor to minimize the risk of forest fires.
  - c. Large populations of pickerel in Great Works Pond create a barrier to out migrating smolts and should be researched further. Habitat upstream of Great Works Pond cannot be utilized by Atlantic salmon until the pickerel populations are diminished.
  - d. Stakeholders pointed out that Water withdrawal for the purposes of fighting fires should be permitted at the discretion of the on-scene responders. It was agreed, however, that this is not an issue appropriately dealt with in a **land** management plan.
  - e. The focus on beavers should be expanded to include general wildlife.
  - f. Residential development of aggressively harvested adjacent lands is not currently happening, as stated in the plan, but has the potential to happen. Text should be modified to reflect the **potential** subdivision of lands.
3. Summary & Wrap Up
  - a. Many comments were positive and encouraging.
  - b. The comment period will be expanded for 10 business days to allow for more input. The deadline for comments is June 20, 2003.
  - c. The classification of Habitat Protection Zones (HPZs) is protective with respect to harvesting and other potential vegetation removal or development activities and that was overwhelmingly favored by stakeholders.
  - d. Visual aids (GIS maps) were distributed to anyone who wanted them.
  - e. On behalf of the Atlantic Salmon Commission, Kleinschmidt thanks the Dennys River Watershed Council for assisting with the Dennys River Corridor Tour and arranging for meeting space at the E.D.M. Youth Center.